

**From:** [Dahl, Donald](#)  
**To:** [Jaimeson Sinclair](#)  
**Cc:** [Bird, Patrick](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Title V Question - Sussman.  
**Date:** Monday, December 4, 2017 11:27:58 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.jpg](#)

---

Good question, Pat will follow up since he is our 129 person. He is at a CT tribe today so we will try to answer this question before the call.

---

**From:** Sinclair, Jaimeson [<mailto:Jaimeson.Sinclair@ct.gov>]

**Sent:** Monday, December 04, 2017 10:58 AM

**To:** Dahl, Donald <[dahl.donald@epa.gov](mailto:dahl.donald@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: Title V Question - Sussman.

Hi Donald. One question that arose down here, was whether or not the tire recycling operation, in and of itself would trigger Title V. I am imagining that the pyrolysis unit owner would be seeking an NSR Permit that would limit emissions to less than the Title V thresholds but am not sure if there may be applicable MACTS or Emissions guidelines...the Section 129 rules come to mind, but arguably pyrolysis is not incineration. And depending upon how the money flows, the tires could be solid waste or a commodity.

---

**From:** Dahl, Donald [<mailto:dahl.donald@epa.gov>]

**Sent:** Monday, December 04, 2017 9:29 AM

**To:** Sinclair, Jaimeson <[Jaimeson.Sinclair@ct.gov](mailto:Jaimeson.Sinclair@ct.gov)>

**Subject:** FW: Title V Question

---

**From:** Conroy, David

**Sent:** Thursday, November 30, 2017 5:27 PM

**To:** Dahl, Donald <[dahl.donald@epa.gov](mailto:dahl.donald@epa.gov)>; Bird, Patrick <[Bird.Patrick@epa.gov](mailto:Bird.Patrick@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** FW: Title V Question

Let me know your thoughts on this before I call Mark.

David Conroy

Air Programs Manager

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 1

Office: 617-918-1661

iPhone: 857-829-8239

Fax: 617-918-0661

---

**From:** Mark R. Sussman [<mailto:MSUSSMAN@murthalaw.com>]

**Sent:** Thursday, November 30, 2017 3:40 PM

**To:** Conroy, David <[Conroy.Dave@epa.gov](mailto:Conroy.Dave@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** Title V Question

Dave, I hope you had a good Thanksgiving Holiday. I wanted to talk with you about a potential project being considered in Connecticut. It is still at a very preliminary stage, so I am not ready to make a formal request for a determination, but hoped you might have a few minutes to talk about the issues either late tomorrow afternoon or sometime next week. The issue involves the question as to whether a facility on land leased from a facility that is a Title V source will need to be included in the existing Title V permit for the existing facility. I'm attaching your letter from last year, which addressed the addition of a fuel cell to the

Pfizer facility. In that letter, you had concluded that the fuel cell and the Pfizer facility should be considered a single source for Title V permitting purposes.

The current project under consideration involves a potential tire recycling facility using a proprietary pyrolysis process. The tire facility would recycle waste tires generating synthetic gas that can be burned in a distributed combined heat and power (“CHP”) facility that supports a manufacturing operation. The tire facility would not only provide gas for the CHP, but would also serve customers that need to recycle tires and would generate carbon black and steel for recycling markets. The tire pyrolysis units would not be operated by the manufacturing facility that has the Title V permit.

From my preliminary discussions with the manufacturer, it seems clear to me that they would be unlikely to contract with the tire facility if EPA and DEEP concluded that they would have to include the tire pyrolysis operation in their Title V permit. The manufacturer is not in the business of recycling tires and since tire recycling is not part of its core function, the manufacturer does not want to assume any compliance obligations for the tire facility.

Unlike the fuel cell at Pfizer, the tire facility would not have a single contract where it sells all of its products to the manufacturing facility. It would have contracts with used tire generators and companies that purchase carbon black and steel. Unlike the Pfizer situation, this facility would not be constructed for the sole purpose of powering the manufacturing facility. Moreover, unlike a fuel cell, which has no real emissions limitations, the tire facility would be subject to its own air emission requirements.

The technology being considered appears to provide a very promising way to recycle and reuse materials from a significant stream of solid waste. The economics seem to work best where the synthetic gas can be used for CHP purposes. In my view, it would be a shame if we cannot find an appropriate host site because the host does not want to assume liabilities from a plant operated by a separate company.

Let me know when you have some time to talk about this. Thank you.

**MARK R. SUSSMAN** | PARTNER

Direct: [860-240-6034](tel:860-240-6034) | Fax: [860-240-5834](tel:860-240-5834) | Mobile: [860-573-9151](tel:860-573-9151) | [msussman@murthalaw.com](mailto:msussman@murthalaw.com)

**MURTHACULLINA**

Murtha Cullina LLP | Attorneys at Law | [www.murthalaw.com](http://www.murthalaw.com)

CityPlace I, 185 Asylum Street | Hartford | CT | 06103



**CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** This message originates from the law firm of Murtha Cullina LLP. The information contained in this e-mail and any files transmitted with it may be a confidential attorney-client communication or may otherwise be privileged and confidential. If the reader of this message, regardless of the address or routing, is not an intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this transmittal in error and any review, use, distribution, dissemination or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please delete this e-mail and all files transmitted with it from your system and immediately notify Murtha Cullina by sending a reply e-mail to the sender of this message. Thank you.

